



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Vol. XIII, when completed, will not be under the same cover.

But even a reviewer, committed in some sort to microscopic criticism, can only feel grateful to the author's skilful hermeneutic for, like Hermes in the Homeric Hymn, Mr. Fox unlocks the treasure and illustrates

. "the birth
Of the bright Gods and the dark desert Earth."

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

Shaksperian Studies. By Members of the Department of English and Comparative Literature in Columbia University. Edited by BRANDER MATTHEWS and ASHLEY HORACE THORNDIKE, New York: Columbia University Press, 1916. 452 pp.

This volume of essays by the professors of a single department in a single university is one of the most noteworthy productions occasioned by the Shakspeare tercentenary. The book is large and illuminative, but it lays no claim to being exhaustive or systematic. As the prefatory note to the work states, "no effort has been made to conform the essays to a general plan or to harmonize conflicting opinions". The productions thus rather loosely brought together are, for the most part, fairly short and general; the volume contains no index, no bibliography, and only an occasional footnote; and the majority of the essays, instead of being composed by specialists in Elizabethan literature, are written by men who have made their reputations as students of such subjects as American literature, composition, and Anglo-Saxon.

Obviously the intention of the editors was to bring together a group of papers that would be readable and suggestive rather than scholarly, as the term is usually understood; hence the reader who consults Shaksperian Studies with the purpose of finding new "facts" about Shakspeare or of studying the detailed solution of specific problems will be disappointed, but he who wishes to read a series of highly interesting discussions of a large number of subjects connected with the great dramatist and his art will welcome the book edited by Professors Matthews and Thorndike. That the subjects treated in the eighteen papers are as varied as they are interesting, is obvious, for matters are handled so widely different as Elizabethan pronunciation and the directions for extracting the boyish qualities in Shakspeare's plays for enthusiastic presentation by present-day preparatory students. On the basis of subject-matter the

eighteen studies may be roughly classified as follows: five deal with Shakspeare's treatment of his sources; three are character studies; two are really running discussions of specific types of Shaksperian criticism; two, by professors in Teachers College, discuss Shakspeare in our modern schools; and one paper deals with each of the following topics: Shakspeare's pronunciation, the text of *Pericles*, Shaksperian stage traditions, the history play, New York productions of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Shakspeare's comments on his art.

It is obviously impossible to discuss here each of the eighteen essays contained in the volume. A few, however, deserve especial mention. Professor Matthews' *Shaksperian Stage Traditions* is unusually interesting and suggestive in its plea that the large number of gestures and stage-business interpretative of various passages in Shakspeare's plays—the contributions, for the most part, of generations of actors and stage managers—be preserved by some future editor of Shakspeare, just as Regnier in his edition of Molière's *Tartuffe* has set down in connection with the dialogue the best of the stage traditions preserved by the *Comédie Française*. The industrious student could no doubt trace at least a few of these traditions back to the very time of Shakspeare himself. Such would be of vital importance, especially to the student, for, after all, no matter how much some of Shakspeare's creatures have been transformed as the result of changes in morals and ways of thinking, the present-day scholar is chiefly interested in finding out, if possible, how such characters as Shylock and Hamlet and Henry V were acted and understood in the Elizabethan period.

Professor Brewster's *The Restoration of Shakspeare's Personality* is an acute discussion of the dangers encountered by the critic who attempts to reconstruct Shakspeare the man out of materials contained in his poems and plays. The paper is full of common sense, but the style will possibly irritate certain present-day champions of the early Victorians and of the German "discoverers" of Shakspeare.

Professor Lawrence's *The Love Story in Troilus and Cressida* will probably appeal to some as being the most suggestive paper in the series, although it is really a more detailed treatment of one point brought out in two recent studies by Professor J. S. P. Tatlock—*The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature*, Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood (P. M. L. A., Dec., 1915) and *The Chief Problem in Shakespeare* (Sewanee Review, April, 1916). These three papers should be read together, for they offer by far the most satisfactory attempt that has yet been made to solve what has been called the "chief problem in the greatest body of poetry in the world". *Troilus and Cressida*, instead of being a burlesque of Homer, a satire of rival poets, or the pessimistic performance of a man disappointed in

love or something else, is a play dealing in a realistic and conventional manner with the Trojan story at a time when the Homeric heroes were not especially venerated and when Pandarus and Cressida, whose conduct was in accord with the best usage advocated by the medieval system of courtly love, had degraded into wantons in consequence of a change in the standards of morality. Finally Professor Cunliffe's explanation of the widely different interpretations of the character of Henry V offered by the Elizabethan and our own age should be read as another instance of the necessity of knowing the temper and ideals of the Elizabethan period before attempting to discuss Shakspeare's characters; and Shakspeare as a Debtor and The Question of Shakspeare's Pronunciation, by Professors Thorndike and Ayres respectively, while necessarily brief and general, are obviously written by men who have a large and intimate knowledge of their subjects.

As would be expected in a book like Shaksperian Studies, some of the papers are not so satisfactory. Two or three are a trifle thin, and it is difficult to see just how A Note On the History Play, interesting as it may be in itself, can be classified as a "Shaksperian study". In the opinion of the reviewer, the first part of Reality and Inconsistency in Shakspeare's Characters could well be condensed; the extravagant praise of Julius Caesar in the essay dealing with the sources of that play will no doubt impress some as being the work of a writer who is unduly saturated with modern realism in his discussion of the highly conventional and poetic drama of the Elizabethan period; and the essay entitled Shakspeare on His Art seems to be an extensive tabulation that really arrives at no definite and noteworthy conclusion.

Again, the book as a whole would have been improved by a little more scholarly attention to details. A few references are vague and incomplete (pp. 320-21), the reader is never told the date of the first American edition of Shakspeare (cf. p. 348), the form *Shakspeare* is used even in titles of books and articles whose authors employed the longer form *Shakespeare*—a case of consistency which may not be acceptable to some of the authors concerned, and which certainly will not meet the approval of the author of *The Name of William Shakespeare* (Philadelphia, 1906). Possibly, too, some of the more squeamish scholars may object to the quotations (pp. 67, 75) from the Everyman editions of Coleridge and Hazlitt.

In addition to its subject-matter, Shaksperian Studies is noteworthy from another point of view. With the exception of a similar series of studies got out by the Department of English at the University of Wisconsin, it is, so far as I know, the only volume published by members of a single English or American university as a part of the Shakspeare tercentenary. That such

a satisfactory collection of essays was produced by the professors of one department in one institution is not only a striking testimonial of the competency of that department, but is significant evidence of the important position which Shakspeare occupies in the educational system of our best universities.

T. S. GRAVES.

TRINITY COLLEGE, N. C.

Une statistique de locaux affectés à l'habitation dans la Rome impériale, by M. EDOUARD CUQ. Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, Tome XL, 1915.

Nothing that M. Édouard Cuq says can pass unnoticed. In the present work he devotes 61 pages to a question which Roman topographers have argued and pondered over, but for which no better answers have been forthcoming than those given by Preller and by Richter. The question turns on the meaning of the word *insula* as used in that interesting document called the Notitia (c. 334 A. D.) or Curiosum urbis Romae regionum XIV (c. 357 A. D.), from which calculations have been made as to the population of Rome in the time of Constantine.

The text reads—*Insulae per totam urbem XLVI.DCII, domus M.DCCXC*, which gives for the fourteen regions of Rome 46,602 *insulae*, and 1,790 *domus*. There is little discussion about the *domus*, it is the *insula* which needs interpretation. Dureau de la Malle first explained an *insula* as a *taberna*, then Preller guessed that it meant a room, and then Richter brought forward the theory that it meant a rented floor in a house, identifying *insula* with *coenaculum*. M. Cuq takes the citations from the Digest and the inscriptions which Richter uses to prove his contention, shows how they do not apply, and then demolishes his argument by the citations from Labeo, Papinian, and Gaius on *superficies solo cedit* which prove that Roman law knew no such thing as house ownership by floors.

The constructive part of M. Cuq's argument begins with page 27. He shows that the *insula* as interpreted in the XII Tables was, like an island, a house with an imprescriptible *ambitus* all about it; that it lost its insularity because of increasing land values as shown by the growth of the *jus projiciendi* and *jus oneris ferendi*; that many neighboring houses or houses with party-walls began in the last century of the Republic to come into the ownership of individuals like Crassus; and that in the early empire, although there is an exceptional use of the word *insula* as an annex to a *domus*, the *insula* became an apartment